

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 18 to 26.

The above amendment is responded to points set forth in the Official Action.

In this regard, new claims 18 to 26 are based on original claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14 and 16 respectively.

In claim 18 (former claim 1), a. the definitions of R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> are now “hydrogen atom” and b. the definition of A is now “a substituted or unsubstituted phenyl group, or a naphthyl group” i.e. those which are mentioned in the present specification, page 6, lines 3-8, and in Claim 6 (except “-OSO<sub>2</sub>NR<sup>1</sup>R<sup>2</sup>”).

Original claims 2-11 have amended or deleted in conformity with the above amendment.

1. On paragraph 2 of the Official Action:

WIPO has acknowledged receipt of the priority document on August 18, 2000.

2. On paragraph 3 of the Official Action:

In view of the Examiner’s rejection, original claims, 15 and 17, which were set forth in use claim form, have been deleted.

3. On paragraph 5 of Official Action:

“A phenyl sulfamate derivative . . . or a salt thereof” in previous claims 1-7 has been amended to “A compound of Formula (I) or its pharmaceutically acceptable salts” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

4. On paragraph 6 of Official Action:

The term “effective amount” has been inserted in claims 23 to 25 (replacing claims 12 to 14).

5. On paragraph 7 of Official Action:

In view of the objections in this paragraph, the word “prophylaxis” has been deleted from the original claim 16 (new claim 26), and the disease treated is “breast cancer” in humans.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Juettner et al. (DE 1136687) or Dunbar et al. (US 3,082,238) or Hodogaya (JP 56083467).

As stated above, “-OSO<sub>2</sub>NR<sup>1</sup>R<sup>2</sup>” has been excluded from the substituents on the phenyl of substituted phenyl which is denoted by “A” in Formula (I) of claim 18 (formerly claim 1) of the present application.

The above amendment clearly and unobviously distinguishes the claimed compounds of the present invention from compounds of Juettner et al., Dunbar et al. and Hodogaya.

Furthermore, none of these cited references teaches or suggests steroid sulfatase inhibiting activity.

Therefore, that the present claims are also unobvious over Juettner et al., Dunbar et al., and/or Hodogaya.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Naoyuki KOIZUMI et al.

By: Matthew Jacob  
Matthew Jacob  
Registration No. 25,154  
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/krl  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
September 29, 2003

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975